Filed 02/29/2008 Case 3:08-cv-00388-L-LSP Document 1 Page 1 of 13 LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL E. LINDSEY MICHAEL E. LINDSEY, State Bar No. 99044 4455 Morena Blyd., Ste. 207 1 08 FEB 29 PM 3: 39 2 San Diego, California 92117-4325 Tel: (858) 270-7000 CLERN, U.S. DISTRICT COURT MALCH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 ANDERSON LAW FIRM 4 MARTIN W. ANDERSON, State Bar No. 178422 DEPUTY 2070 North Tustin Avenue 5 Santa Ana, California 92705 Tel: (714) 516-2700 • Fax: (714) 532-4700 6 E-mail: martin@andersonlaw.net 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Alex Dominguez 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 '08 CV 388 -11 CALIFORNIA 92705 ANDERSON LAW FIRM 2070 NORTH TUSTIN AVENUE ALEX DOMINGUEZ, 12 Case No. **COMPLAINT** 13 Plaintiff, **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 14 15 v. SANTA ANA, 16 FOUR WINDS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, 17 18 Defendant. 19 Plaintiff alleges as follows: 20 21 **JURISDICTION** 22 This Court has original jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 1. U.S.C. § 1332, because this is a civil action between citizens of different states and 23 the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00. Plaintiff is citizen of the state of 24 California. Defendant Four Winds International Corporation is a corporation that 25 is organized and existing under the laws of the state of Delaware and having its 26 principal place of business in the state of Indiana. 27 28 original

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2. This Court has o	riginal jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1331, because the ac	ction alleges claims pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2310.
The Court has jurisdiction over	er the supplemental state law claims pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1367.	
	PARTIES

- As used in this Complaint, the word "Plaintiff" shall refer to Plaintiff 3. Alex Dominguez.
- 4. As used in this Complaint, the word "Defendant" shall refer to all Defendants named in this Complaint.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT BREACH OF THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) AND CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794

- On or about September 16, 2006, Plaintiff purchased a 2007 Four 5. Winds Class C, VIN # 1GBJG31U861269163 (hereafter "Recreational Vehicle") which was manufactured, distributed, or sold by Defendant. The total consideration which Plaintiff paid or agreed to pay, including taxes, license, and finance charges is \$95,736.60. The Recreational Vehicle was purchased primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. Plaintiff purchased the Recreational Vehicle from a person or entity engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, or selling consumer goods at retail.
- In connection with the purchase, Plaintiff received an express written 6. warranty in which Defendant undertook to preserve or maintain the utility or performance of the Recreational Vehicle or to provide compensation if there is a failure in utility or performance for a specified period of time. The warranty provided, in relevant part, that in the event a defect developed with the

4

SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92705

ANDERSON LAW FIRM

- During the warranty period, the Recreational Vehicle contained or 7. developed defects which cause water to leak into the coach and defects which cause mold to grow inside the coach.
- Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2301 (which defines the implied warranty by 8. borrowing the provisions of Civil Code §§ 1792 and 1791.1) and pursuant to Civil Code §§ 1792 and 1791.1, the sale of the Recreational Vehicle was accompanied by Defendant's implied warranty of merchantability. The duration of the implied warranty is coextensive in duration with the duration of the express written warranty provided by Defendant.
- The implied warranty of merchantability means and includes that the 9. Recreational Vehicle will comply with each of the following requirements: (1) The Recreational Vehicle will pass without objection in the trade under the contract description; (2) The Recreational Vehicle is fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are used; (3) The Recreational Vehicle is adequately contained, packaged, and labeled; and (4) The Recreational Vehicle will conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label.
- On or about September 16, 2006, or during the time period in which the implied warranty was in effect, the Recreational Vehicle contained or developed the defects stated in paragraph 7, above. The existence of each of these defects constitutes a breach of the implied warranty because the Recreational Vehicle (1) does not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description, (2) is not fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are used, (3) is not adequately contained, packaged, and labeled, and (4) does not conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label.

	11.	Plaintiff has rightfully rejected and/or justifiably revoked acceptance
of the	Recre	ational Vehicle, and has exercised a right to cancel the sale. By
servin	g this	Complaint, Plaintiff does so again. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks the
remed	lies pro	ovided in California Civil Code section 1794(b)(1), including the entire
purcha	ase pri	ce. In addition, Plaintiff seeks the remedies set forth in California
Civil (Code s	section 1794(b)(2), including the diminution in value of the
Recre	ationa	Vehicle resulting from its defects. Plaintiff believes that, at the
preser	nt time	, the Recreational Vehicle's value is de minimis.

- 12. Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under the implied warranty, and therefore brings this claim pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) and Civil Code § 1794.
- 13. Defendant does not maintain an informal dispute resolution process for the purpose of resolving claims for breach of the implied warranty of merchantability, and does not maintain an informal dispute resolution process for resolving express warranty claims that complies with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 2310(a) and the rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto by the Federal Trade Commission.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT BREACH OF THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF FITNESS 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) AND CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794

- 14. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 5 through 7 and paragraph 11, above.
- 15. Defendant is a manufacturer, distributor, or seller who had reason to know at the time of the retail sale that the Recreational Vehicle was required for a particular purpose and that the Plaintiff was relying on the Defendant's skill or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods.

16. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2301 (which defines the implied warranty b	У
borrowing the provisions of Civil Code § 1792.1) and pursuant to Civil Code §	
1792.1, the sale of the Recreational Vehicle was accompanied by Defendant's	
implied warranty that the Recreational Vehicle would be fit for Plaintiff's	
particular purpose. The duration of the implied warranty is coextensive in durati	on
with the duration of the express written warranty provided by Defendant.	

- 17. On or about September 16, 2006, or during the time period in which the implied warranty was in effect, the Recreational Vehicle contained or developed the defects stated in paragraph 7, above. The existence of each of these defects constitutes a breach of the implied warranty because the Recreational Vehicle is not fit for Plaintiff's particular purpose.
- 18. Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under the implied warranty, and therefore brings this claim pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) and Civil Code § 1794.
- 19. Defendant does not maintain an informal dispute resolution process for the purpose of resolving claims for breach of the implied warranty of merchantability, and does not maintain an informal dispute resolution process for resolving express warranty claims that complies with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 2310(a) and the rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto by the Federal Trade Commission.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) AND CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794

- 20. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 5 through 7 and paragraph 11, above.
- 21. In accordance with Defendant's warranty, Plaintiff delivered the Recreational Vehicle to Defendant's representative in this state to perform

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

warranty repairs. Plaintiff did so within a reasonable time. Each time Plaintiff
delivered the Recreational Vehicle, Plaintiff notified Defendant and its
representative of the characteristics of the defects. However, the representative
failed to repair the Recreational Vehicle, breaching the terms of the written
warranty on each occasion.

- Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its 22. obligations under the express warranty, and therefore brings this claim pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) and Civil Code § 1794.
- 23. Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under the express warranty was willful, in that Defendant and its representative were aware of their obligation to repair the Recreational Vehicle under the express warranty, but they intentionally declined to fulfill that obligation. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a civil penalty of two times Plaintiff's actual damages pursuant to Civil Code § 1794(c) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).
- 24. Defendant does not maintain an informal dispute resolution mechanism which complies with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 2310(a) and the rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto by the Federal Trade Commission.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT FAILURE TO PROMPTLY REPURCHASE PRODUCT 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) AND CAL. CIV. CODE § 1793.2(d)

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in 25. paragraphs 5 through 7, above.
- Defendant and its representatives in this state have been unable to 26. service or repair the Recreational Vehicle to conform to the applicable express warranties after a reasonable number of attempts. Despite this fact, Defendant failed to promptly replace the Recreational Vehicle or make restitution to Plaintiff as required by Civil Code §§ 1793.2(d) and 1793.1(a)(2).

2

3

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

8

9

- Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its 27. obligations pursuant to Civil Code §§ 1793.2(d) and 1793.1(a)(2), and therefore brings this claim pursuant to § 1794.
- The provisions of Civil Code § 1793.2(d) existed at the time 28. Defendant gave the express warranty and for that reason those provisions were incorporated into the terms of the express warranty by operation of California law. Swenson v. File, 3 Cal.3d 389, 393; Washington Internat. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court, 62 Cal.App.4th 981, 988-89 (1998). Accordingly, Defendant's violation of § 1793.2(b) was a breach of terms of the express warranty, and Plaintiff brings this claim pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).
- Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under § 1793.2(d) was willful, in that Defendant and its representative were aware that they were unable to service or repair the Recreational Vehicle to conform to the applicable express warranties after a reasonable number of repair attempts, yet Defendant failed and refused to promptly replace the Recreational Vehicle or make restitution despite Plaintiff's demand. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a civil penalty of two times Plaintiff's actual damages pursuant to § 1794(c) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).
- Defendant does not maintain a qualified third-party dispute resolution 30. process which substantially complies with § 1793.22. Despite Defendant's violation of § 1793.2(d) and its notice thereof, Defendant failed to comply with its obligations within a reasonable time. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a civil penalty of two times Plaintiff's actual damages pursuant to Civil Code § 1794(e) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).
- Plaintiff seeks civil penalties pursuant to § 1794, subdivisions (c) and 31. (e) in the alternative and does not seek to cumulate civil penalties, as provided in § 1794(f).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

32. Defendant does not maintain an informal dispute resolution mechanism which complies with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 2310(a) and the rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto by the Federal Trade Commission.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT

FAILURE TO COMMENCE REPAIRS WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME AND TO COMPLETE THEM WITHIN 30 DAYS 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d) AND CAL. CIV. CODE § 1794

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in 33. paragraphs 5 through 7 and paragraph 11, above.
- Although Plaintiff delivered the Recreational Vehicle to Defendant's representative in this state, Defendant and its representative failed to commence the service or repairs within a reasonable time and failed to service or repair the Recreational Vehicle so as to conform to the applicable warranties within 30 days, in violation of Civil Code § 1793.2(b). Plaintiff did not extend the time for completion of repairs beyond the 30-day requirement.
- Plaintiff has been damaged by Defendant's failure to comply with its 35. obligations pursuant to § 1793.2(b), and therefore brings this claim pursuant to § 1794.
- The provisions of Civil Code § 1793.2(b) existed at the time 36. Defendant gave the express warranty and for that reason those provisions were incorporated into the terms of the express warranty by operation of California law. Swenson v. File, 3 Cal.3d 389, 393; Washington Internat. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court, 62 Cal.App.4th 981, 988-89 (1998). Accordingly, Defendant's violation of § 1793.2(b) was a breach of terms of the express warranty, and Plaintiff brings this claim pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).
- Defendant's failure to comply with its obligations under § 1793.2(b) 37. was willful, in that Defendant and its representative were aware that they were

obligated to service or repair the Recreational Vehicle to conform to the applicable
express warranties within 30 days, yet they failed to do so. Accordingly, Plaintiff
is entitled to a civil penalty of two times Plaintiff's actual damages pursuant to §
1794(c) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).

38. Defendant does not maintain an informal dispute resolution mechanism which complies with the requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 2310(a) and the rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto by the Federal Trade Commission.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CONVERSION

- 39. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the Fourth Claim for Relief, above.
- 40. Plaintiff is the owner of and has an immediate right to possession of a specific sum of money which is capable of identification. *Farmers Ins. Ex. v. Zerin*, 53 Cal.App.4th 445, 451-52 (1997). Specifically, pursuant to Civil Code § 1793.2(d), Plaintiff is entitled to restitution of the amounts paid or payable for the Recreational Vehicle from Defendant.
- 41. Instead of delivering the money to which Plaintiff is entitled to Plaintiff, Defendant has wrongfully converted that money for its own use.
 - 42. As a result of Defendant's conversion, Plaintiff has suffered damages.
- 43. Defendant's conduct was fraudulent, oppressive, and malicious, and thus, Plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages pursuant to Civil Code section 3294. Specifically, Defendant was aware of its obligation to make restitution to Plaintiff and intentionally failed to do so. In addition, Defendant falsely and intentionally misrepresented to Plaintiff that it was not obligated to make restitution. Furthermore, Defendant is aware that Plaintiff has little choice but to continue using the defective Recreational Vehicle, and Defendant

2

3

4

5

6

	/
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

DATED: February 25, 2008

intentionally refused to make restitution to Plaintiff with the intent of arguing that			
Plaintiff's continued use is a reason to deny restitution to Plaintiff.			
<u>PRAYER</u>			
PLAINTIFF PRAYS for judgment against Defendant as follows:			
1. For Plaintiff's damages in the amount of at least \$95,736.60.			
2. For restitution to Plaintiff in the amount of \$95,736.60.			
3. On Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief, for a civil penalty in the amount			
of \$191,473.20, which is two times Plaintiff's total damages, pursuant to Civil			
Code § 1794(c) and (e) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).			
4. On Plaintiff's Fourth Claim for Relief, for a civil penalty in the			
amount of \$191,473.20, which is two times Plaintiff's total damages, pursuant to			
Civil Code § 1794(c) and (e) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).			
5. On Plaintiff's Fifth Claim for Relief, for a civil penalty in the amount			
of \$191,473.20, which is two times Plaintiff's total damages, pursuant to Civil			
Code § 1794(c) and (e) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).			
6. For any consequential and incidental damages.			
7. For punitive damages in the amount of at least \$100,000.			
8. For costs of the suit and Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant			
to Civil Code § 1794(d) and 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d).			
9. For prejudgment interest at the legal rate.			
10. And for such other relief as the Court may deem proper.			

ANDERSON LAW FIRM MARTIN W. ANDERSON MICHAEL E. LINDSEY

By:

MARTIN W. ANDERSON Attorneys for Plaintiff Alex Dominguez **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on all causes of action asserted herein.

DATED: February 25, 2008

ANDERSON LAW FIRM MARTIN W. ANDERSON MICHAEL E. LINDSEY

By:

MARTIN W. ANDERSON Attorneys for Plaintiff Alex Dominguez

TELEPHONE: (714) 516-2700

SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92705 2070 NORTH TUSTIN AVENUE

ANDERSON LAW FIRM

COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

148249 - KD
* * C O P Y * *
February 29, 2008
16:17:12

Civ Fil Non-Pris

·USAO #.: 08CV0388

Judge..: M. JAMES LORENZ

Amount.:

\$350.00 CK

Check#.: BC 1149

Total-> \$350.00

FROM: CIVIL FILING

DOMINGUEZ V. FOUR WINDS

08CV0388

SS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANT	TS .	7,0
ALEX DOMINGUEZ		FOUR WIND	S INTERNATOGNATIC	ĴŖ ŗĴ⊙Ĵ RATION
	e of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego County EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	NOTE: IN I	ce of First Listed Defendant IC C (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES AND CONDEMNATION CASES, UND INVOLVED.	S ONLY)
(a) Augusta (b) 31		Attorneys (If Know	* 1 1	OL: OT
	e, Address, and Telephone Number)	l '		1 100
Tel: (714) 516-2700	70 N. Tustin Ave., Santa Ana, CA 9270	~ ₌)8 CV 388 ·	L LSP
II. BASIS OF JURISE	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP O	F PRINCIPAL PARTIES	S(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Or Citizen of This State	PTF DEF I Incorporated or of Business In T	
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	₩ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	☐ 2 ☐ 2 Incorporated and of Business I	d Principal Place
200	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3 ☐ 3 Foreign Nation	0606
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			·
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 196 Franchise 1910 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Slander 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 385 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability 386 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability Injury	620 Other Food & Drug		470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts
🔀 1 Original 🗇 2 R	State Court Appellate Court	Reopened a	ransferred from onther district specify) 6 Multidi Litigati	on Indement
VI CALICE OF ACE	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a	re filing (Do not cite jurisdic	ctional statutes unless diversity):
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Brief description of cause: Consumer Warranty Action			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	N	N DEMAND \$ 337,209.80	CHECK YES or JURY DEMAN	nly if demanded in complaint: (D: Ø Yes D No
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 02/25/2008	SIGNATURE OF	TORNEY OF RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				
RECEIPT # 148249	AMOUNT \$30 APPLYING IFP	M 2/19/08 JUD	GE MAG.	JUDGE

